

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>FLORENCE CAESAR,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:10-CV-202</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	<b>(Judge Conner)</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF</b>	:	
<b>CORRECTIONS, <i>et al.</i>,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendants</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 9th day of February, 2012, upon consideration of correspondence (Doc. 85) filed by plaintiff Florence Caesar (“Caesar”), wherein Caesar appeals the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 74) of the United States Magistrate Judge, the Honorable J. Andrew Smyser, and the court construing the correspondence as a motion for reconsideration of the undersigned’s order (Doc. 83) dated January 19, 2012, wherein the court adopted the Report’s recommendation to deny Caesar’s motion (Doc. 63) for preliminary injunction, and the court noting that the purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to present newly discovered evidence or to correct manifest errors of law or fact, see Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985), that the court possesses inherent power to reconsider its orders “when it is consonant with justice to do so,” United States v. Jerry, 487 F.2d 600, 605 (3d Cir. 1973); Alea N. Am. Ins. Co. v. Salem Masonry Co. 301 F. App’x 119, 121 (3d Cir. 2008), and that a party may not invoke a motion for reconsideration as a means to relitigate matters of disagreement with

the court, see Abu-Jamal v. Horn, No. Civ. A. 99-5089, 2001 WL 1609761, at \*9 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 18, 2001), and the court concluding that Caesar has neither presented newly discovered evidence nor demonstrated that the January 19, 2012, order (Doc. 83) contains a manifest error of law or fact, it is hereby ORDERED that the motion (Doc. 85) for reconsideration is DENIED.

S/ Christopher C. Conner  
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
United States District Judge